

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-26 are rejected, and reconsideration of the rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-3, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 17-22, 24, and 26 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 8-9, 11-12, 14, 17-22, 24, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,687,348 issued to Cromer et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Cromer") in view of U.S. Patent 5,377,260 issued to Long. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Cromer and Long do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "a control part to compare a caller ID (identification) with a predetermined ID when the caller ID and a ring signal are received through the PSTN, to control the power-on signal generator to generate the power-on signal when the caller ID is identical to the predetermined ID, and to control the ring signal to be transmitted to a telephone when the caller ID is different from the predetermined ID," as recited in independent claim 1.

Page 3 of the Office Action asserts, "It would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the teachings of Long into the teachings of Cromer providing for a more useful system," (col. 8, lines 17-25).

The mere fact, however, that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested in the Office Action does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification. In re Fritch, 972 F. 2d 1260, 1266, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1783-84 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Long does not even disclose, teach, or suggest a "remote power controller" or a "power on signal generator." Instead, Long only discloses allowing or blocking access to a phone or data modem. Long recognizes the problem of blocking unwanted callers using Caller ID. However, Long does not even contemplate the problem of powering-on an electronic device, which is turned off. Instead, the phone and data modems referred to in Long are always turned on.

Further, a "remote power controller" or a "power-on signal generator" was not among the list of devices in col. 8, lines 17-25, and signals for turning on or off the devices in the list provided in col. 8, lines 17-25 was not disclosed.

Because Long does not even recognize the problems solved by the present invention,

Long can not teach or suggest solutions provided by the present invention. For example, Long does not even teach a remote controller performing a comparison of a caller ID to a predetermined ID to determine whether an electronic device needs to be enabled or to send a ring signal to a telephone. Instead, Long only teaches blocking unwanted signals rather than performing a comparison to determine what type of signal should be generated or controlled.

Although Cromer discloses a method for remotely powering up a computer when a caller ID signal matches a predetermined authorized telephone number, Cromer does not disclose, teach, or suggest controlling a ring signal to be transmitted to a telephone when the caller ID is different from the predetermined ID (as noted on page 5 of the Office Action). Therefore, Cromer does not even contemplate using a Caller ID comparison to control both generation of a power-on signal and control of the ring signal.

To set forth a prima facie §103 rejection, there must be some evidenced reason for modifying a reference. Specifically, there must be evidence, outside of the present application, which motivates, leads, or suggests to one of ordinary skill to modify a reference. In addition, an "obvious to try" rationale for combining two references is not valid motivation under 35 USC §103. *In re Goodwin*, 576 F.2d 375, 377, 198 USPQ 1, 3 (CCPA 1978); *In re Antonie*, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977); *In re Tomlinson*, 363 F.2d 928, 150 USPQ 623 (CCPA 1966).

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action does not provide any evidenced reason for modifying Cromer. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 2, 3, 8, and 9 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons claims 2, 3, 8, and 9 are also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Similarly, Cromer and Long do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "controlling the electronic device to be enabled when the caller ID is identical to the predetermined ID, and controlling the ring signal to be transmitted to a telephone when the caller ID is different from the predetermined ID," as recited in independent claim 11.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 11 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 12, 14, and 17 depend from claim 11 and include all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons claims 12, 14, and 17 are also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Similarly, Cromer and Long do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "a remote power controller to enable the remote electronic device or to ring the remote telephone based upon a comparison between a caller ID (identification) of the call from the local telephone and a predetermined ID," as recited in independent claim 18.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 18 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 19-22, 24, and 26 depend from claim 18 and include all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons claims 19-22, 24, and 26 are also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Rejection of Claims 4-7, 10, 13, 15, 16, 23, and 25 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 4-7, 10, 13, 15, 16, 23, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cromer in view of Long and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,737,400 issued to Bagchi et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Bagchi"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Bagchi does not cure the deficiencies of Cromer and Long. As with Long, Bagchi only discloses blocking or permitting a call signal to be routed based on Caller ID.

Cromer, Long, and Bagchi, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest at least, "a control part to compare a caller ID (identification) with a predetermined ID when the caller ID and a ring signal are received through the PSTN, to control the power-on signal generator to generate the power-on signal when the caller ID is identical to the predetermined ID, and to control the ring signal to be transmitted to a telephone when the caller ID is different from the predetermined ID, as recited in claim 1 from which claims 4-7 and 10 depend.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 4-7 and 10 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons claims 4-7 and 10 are also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Similarly, Cromer, Long, and Bagchi, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest at least, "controlling the electronic device to be enabled when the caller ID is identical to the predetermined ID, and controlling the ring signal to be transmitted to a telephone when the caller ID is different from the predetermined ID," as recited in claim 11 from which

claims 13, 15, and 16 depend.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 11 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 13, 15, and 16 depend from claim 11 and include all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 13, 15, and 16 are also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Similarly, Cromer, Long, and Bagchi, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest at least, " a remote power controller to enable the remote electronic device or to ring the remote telephone based upon a comparison between a caller ID (identification) of the call from the local telephone and a predetermined ID, " as recited in claim 18 from which claims 23 and 25 depend.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 18 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 23 and 25 depend from claim 18 and include all of the features of claim 18. Therefore, for at least these reasons claims 23 and 25 are also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Summary

Claims 1-26 are pending and under consideration. It is respectfully submitted that none of the references taken alone or in combination disclose the present claimed invention.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

September 28, 2005

By:

Paul F. Daebeler

Paul F. Daebeler
Registration No. 35,852

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501